

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed September 29, 2004. All rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the amendments and remarks herein. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-39 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-39 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 16, 18, 33, 35, 36 38 and 39 are independent.

Claims 1, 5, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 28, 33, 34, and 35-39 are herein amended.

Claims 2 and 19 are herein cancelled.

The Office Action objects to claims 28-31, 34 and 37 based on an improper dependency. Claims 28, 34 and 37 has been herein amended to depend from claims 27, 33 and 36, respectively.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5, 9, 15, 16, 18-20, 22, 26, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Hamilton et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,559,860 ('860 hereinafter). The present invention is distinguishable from Hamilton '860, however, because Hamilton discloses a graphical application for defining an anchor point between objects which designates a pivot point relative to the objects, as disclosed at Col. 13, lines 58-62. The present claims, in contrast, discuss a graphical user interface (GUI) for simultaneous display of information about resource objects resulting from applying respective functions associated with resource tasks on the resource objects, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, in contrast to Hamilton, the present application claims subject matter directed to independently applying functions to each of a plurality of resource objects, as discussed further below.

In further detail, the Office Action rejects claim 1 based on the suggestion that Hamilton '860 teaches concurrently displaying the resource information for each selected resource object (Col. 13, lines 56-64 and related Figures). The Office Action further rejects claims 2 and 5 based on the suggestion that Hamilton '860 discloses concurrently displaying resource information produced

from applying multiple functions associated with multiple resource tasks, at col. 15, lines 15-22. The present invention differs from Hamilton, however, because the anchor points in Hamilton denote the physical orientation of a particular object on the screen. Hamilton, therefore, discloses anchoring on-screen objects based on the anchor point, and manipulating the objects relative to the anchor point, or pivot point (13:61). Therefore, Hamilton '860 performs the same anchoring function for "anchoring" the objects to the pivot points for each such anchored object. As such, Hamilton applies the same function, not multiple functions. Hamilton does not disclose independently applying multiple functions associated with multiple tasks and concurrently displaying the results.

Therefore, Hamilton '860 does not show, teach or disclose concurrently displaying resource information for each respective associated function for the resource objects to which that function is applied in respective shared output display areas, as claimed in original Claim 5. Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended with subject matter of original claims 2 and 5 to recite concurrently displaying the resource information for each selected resource object further comprising concurrently displaying resource information for each respective associated function for the resource objects to which that function is applied in respective shared output display areas, such that a user of the computer system can concurrently compare resource information produced from applying multiple functions associated with multiple resource tasks on multiple resource objects, to further clarify and distinguish the present invention. Further discussion and support for this amendment may be found on page 28:line 26-page 29:line 7 of the specification as filed. Claim 1 is therefore believed allowable in light of these remarks and amendments and it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn. Further, Independent claim 35, rejected on similar grounds, has been likewise amended and is therefore also deemed allowable.

The Office Action rejects claim 16 as being of similar scope as claim 1 and rejects claim 16 under the same rationale. Hamilton '860, however, displays only

a single grid, and does not show, teach, or disclose receiving a selection of at least one view panel in a shared output display. Further, as indicated above, Hamilton '860 discloses an anchor point defining a pivot point (13:60-61), and does not show, teach, or disclose receiving a function of at least one resource task identifying a function, nor does Hamilton show, teach or disclose receiving a modification to such a selection. Hamilton '860, on the contrary, shows only the anchor point 166 in a page window 144.

Accordingly, claim 16 has been amended with the subject matter of claim 17, to recite receiving a selection of at least one view panel in a shared output display area to be a target panel, and receiving a modification to the selection of the at least one resource task identifying a function to apply to the selection of at least two resource objects, to further clarify and distinguish the invention defined in claim 16. Further discussion and support concerning the shared view panel may be found in the specification as filed at page 8, lines 13-14.

The Office Action further rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Hamilton '860 in view of Shalit et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,714,971. Shalit '971, however, is inapplicable because Shalit '971 discloses icon-based or menu bar driven user selection of opening a new pane (2:3-5). Shalit '971 then displays the contents of the selected existing item in the new pane (2:6-7). Shalit does not disclose a selection or modification of a resource task and corresponding function, as recited in claim 17. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Shalit to modify the present claims because Shalit teaches traversing hierarchical contents of a passive file system, in which file elements are hierarchically arranged to include other file elements. The present invention claims a system for traversing resource objects in a storage area network, such as storage arrays, switching devices, and host computers (page 8, lines 15-17), and performing active functions on selection of the resource task identifying a function operable on the storage area network entities, also known as manageable entities (page 9, lines 22-24). Shalit does not show, teach, or suggest, alone or in combination, applying the modification to any selected

resource objects to produce a second set of resource information, and concurrently displaying the second set of resource information in the target panel for viewing by a user of the graphical user interface while concurrently displaying at least portion of the first set of resource information in a view panel that is not the target panel, as recited in claim 17. Accordingly, claim 17 is therefore believed allowable (elements of which are now amended into claim 16, from which it depends, as discussed above).

Further, claims 33, 36 and 39 are of similar scope to claim 16 and has been rejected on similar grounds. Accordingly, claim 39 has been herein amended similarly and is likewise deemed allowable.

The Office Action also rejects claim 18 upon similar grounds as claim 1. Claim 18 has been herein amended with the subject matter of claim 22 similar to claim 1, above, and accordingly, is believed allowable for the reasons given above. Further, nowhere in Hamilton '860 is shown, disclosed, or suggested receiving a selection of at least two different resource tasks, each having at least one respective associated function which the step of applying applies to at least one of each selected resource object to produce resource information as a result of the function, and applying the functions such that the resource management process applies each respective associated function of each of the at least two selected resource tasks to data associated with at least one of each selected resource object to produce resource information for each respective associated function for the resource objects to which that function is applied. Accordingly, as suggested above, the present claim 18 claims the selection of two different resource tasks, each indicative of a function, independently applying the functions to the data attributed to multiple resource objects, and concurrently displaying the data. Hamilton, in contrast, teaches the anchor point defining the pivot point for the anchored, on-screen object. No such selection of tasks and independent application of the functions to the selected resource objects is shown, taught or disclosed in Hamilton '860.

Accordingly, in an overabundance of caution, and to further the case to allowance, applicant has clarified the distinguishing features by amending claim 18 to recite receiving a selection of at least two different resource tasks, each having at least one respective associated function which the step of applying applies to at least one of each selected resource object to produce resource information as a result of the function, in which the resource management process applies each respective associated function of each of the at least two selected resource tasks to data associated with at least one of each selected resource object to produce resource information for each respective associated function for the resource objects to which that function is applied, such that the resource management process concurrently displays resource information for each respective associated function for the resource objects to which that function is applied in respective shared output display areas, such that a user of the computer system can concurrently compare resource information produced from applying multiple functions associated with multiple resource tasks on multiple resource objects, as previously recited in dependent claim 22.

Claim 18 is therefore believed allowable in light of these remarks and amendments and it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn. Further, Independent claim 38, rejected on similar grounds, has been likewise amended and is therefore also deemed allowable.

As the remaining claims depend from, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 18, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0901.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 366-9600, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. Lutz, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 44,883
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 366-9600
Facsimile: (508) 616-9805
Customer No.: 022468

Attorney Docket No.: EMC01-07(01042)

Dated: January 31, 2005